<u>REMARKS/ARGUMENTS</u>

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-10, 13-19, 22-28, and 31-38 are pending in the present Application, Claim 34 having been amended.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, 24, 28, 33, 37, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by <u>Toyoda</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,966); Claims 4, 5, 7, 13, 14, 16, 22, 23, 25, 31, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Toyoda</u> in view of <u>Kakimoto</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,688); Claims 8, 17, 26, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Toyoda</u> in view of <u>Kakimoto</u>, and further in view of <u>Merritt et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,429, hereinafter <u>Merritt</u>); and Claims 9, 18, 27, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Toyoda</u> in view of <u>Bowker et al.</u> (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0039615, hereinafter <u>Bowker</u>).

With respect to the objection to Claim 34, Claim 34 is amended to depend from Claim 28. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claim 34 be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by <u>Toyoda</u>, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "an accommodating capability verifying unit configured to verify an information accommodating capability in said reception terminal or in a communication system encompassing said reception terminal, based only on a domain of an E-mail address used in sending the E-mail information to said reception terminal."

In a non-limiting embodiment of the claimed invention, the information processing apparatus verifies the capability of the reception terminal without having to query another apparatus. This can be done by verifying the capability of the reception terminal based only

13

on a domain of an E-mail address used in sending E-mail information to the reception

terminal.

As described in the specification, a domain name is used for identifying a company,

organization, E-mail servicing company, an Internet provider or a personal computer

communication firm, and is set from one company or E-mail servicing company etc., to

another.[1]

Toyoda does not disclose or suggest verifying the capability of the reception terminal

based only on a domain name of an E-mail address.

Toyoda discloses a system in which a facsimile apparatus makes an inquiry, about the

capability of a destination apparatus, to a local server. When the local server does not know

the capability information, the facsimile apparatus makes an inquiry to a DNS server.[2]

Local server 13A may store capability information about the destination terminals in a

capability exchange table.[3] In the capability exchange table 50, one or a plurality of names of

the kind of destination terminal is registered to be associated with the mail address of the

destination terminal. Capability of the destination terminal is determined in accordance with

the kind of destination terminal. In the capability exchange table 50, a capability table is

prepared for each kind of destination terminal. In the capability table, there are described

capability items such as resolution, a paper size, a compression format, an encryption format,

color, and the other, and a capability content corresponding to each capability item.[4]

Thus, when using a local server to determine the capabilities of a reception terminal,

Toyoda discloses using the kind of destination terminal. The kind of destination terminal

does not equate to using only the domain of the E-mail address of the reception terminal.

Furthermore, Fig. 5 of Toyoda discloses that capability items are stored along with the name

---

[1] Specification, page 13, lines 6-11.
[2] Toyoda, Abstract.
[3] Toyoda, col. 6, lines 37-39.
[4] Toyoda, col. 6, lines 46-54.

of the kind of apparatus. Although Fig. 5 of Toyoda shows that the mail address of the device is stored in the same table as the name of the kind of apparatus, this does not suggest using only the domain of the E-mail address to verify the capabilities of the reception terminal.

If the local server 13A does not have the capability information of the reception terminal, Toyoda discloses accessing DNS server 14A. DNS server 14A uses the host name, and not the domain name, to determine the capabilities of the reception device.

The host name refers to the name of the specific machine that is the reception terminal. The host name is not the domain name. For example, if a host name (ifax1) is included in the mail address as in "xxx @ ifax1.abc.co.jp," capability information is searched and obtained using a FAX record in connection with the host name (ifax1).[5]

Also, if no host name is included in the mail address as in "xxx @ abc.co.jp," capability information is searched and obtained using a user name (xxx) put before @ mark.[6]

Although Toyoda discloses that DNS server 14A manages a domain name, the domain name is not used alone to determine the capabilities of the reception device. Fig. 6 of Toyoda is a zone information table. As shown in Fig. 6, there are two facsimile machines in domain abc.co.jp; ifax1 and ifax2. Thus, using only the domain, the system disclosed in Toyoda cannot determine the capabilities of the reception terminal (either ifax1 or 1fax2). The system disclosed in Toyoda needs the host name or user name to determine the capabilities of the reception terminal.

Thus, Toyoda does not disclose or suggest the claimed "…verify an information accommodating capability in said reception terminal or in a communication system encompassing said reception terminal, based only on a domain of an E-mail address used in sending the E-mail information to said reception terminal."

---

[5] Toyoda, col. 13, lines 35-38.
[6] Toyoda, col. 13, lines 38-41.

Furthermore, <u>Bowker</u>, <u>Kakimoto</u>, and <u>Merritt</u> do not cure the above-noted deficiencies in <u>Toyoda</u>.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 4-9) patentably distinguish over <u>Maeda</u>, <u>Bowker</u>, <u>Toyoda</u>, <u>Kakimoto</u>, and <u>Merritt</u>, taken alone or in proper combination. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10, 19, 28, 37, and 38 are similar to Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10, 19, 28, 37, and 38 (and Claims 13-18, 21-27, and 31-36) patentably distinguish over <u>Maeda</u>, <u>Bowker</u>, <u>Toyoda</u>, <u>Kakimoto</u>, and <u>Merritt</u>, taken alone or in proper combination, for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JW\275754US\AMENDMEN1.DOC